



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,048	07/23/2003	Katherine Barabash	IL920030014US1	1091

7590 05/02/2007  
Stephen C. Kaufman,  
Intellectual Property Law Dept.  
IBM Corporation  
P.O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER
----------

SAEED, USMAAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/02/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/625,048	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BARABASH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Usmaan Saeed	<b>Art Unit</b> 2166	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Usmaan Saeed (PTO).

(3) Daniel J. Swirsky Reg # 45,148.

(2) Leslie Wong (PTO).

(4) Yoav Ossia IBM.

Date of Interview: 25 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 12 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Printezis et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**MOHAMMAD ALI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative described the invention and discussed rejected claims, cited prior art. Regarding claim 12 applicant discussed that Printezis does not teach, "only if the card to which the object belongs is not marked." In response examiner pointed the applicant to figure 1 and pointed to limitation c of the claim, which recites, "unmarking a marked card comprising any of said object." Applicant stated that he would delete the limitation c, which recites, "unmarking a marked card comprising any of said objects." Examiner then pointed out that if the limitation c is deleted from the claim, then the claim would appear to overcome the cited reference.

Further regarding claim 20 applicant proposed deleting limitation c and also amending the claim to recite "at any time while performing concurrently any of step a-g." Examiner also thought that these amendments would appear to overcome the cited prior art. All in all, the interview was productive in advancing the prosecution.